

**Kyle, Wonda - ESA**

---

**From:** Staten, Jill [jstaten@ctxcu.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 01, 2004 7:31 PM  
**To:** 'ofccp-public@dol.gov'  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule on Required Recordkeeping for Internet Job Applicants

ChevronTexaco Credit Union is a company with 148 employees. We are a non-profit organization, and do not have the budget for any kind of automated applicant tracking system. As a financial institution, we are subject to Affirmative Action requirements, which is obviously a manual process for us. Nevertheless, we maintain a current Affirmative Action Plan every year, including tracking applicant data.

We receive hundreds of resumes per week through fax, mail and especially the Internet. Many of them actually say in their cover letters that they have the qualifications for the position, which their resumes indicate they do not have. Few of these candidates can seriously be considered for our open positions. Yet the proposed regulations can be regarded as requiring us to obtain gender, race and ethnicity data for all of these people, and also to track it by position. This may not seem like a large burden to you, but to us, it's huge.

Rather than requiring this huge administrative burden of all employers, I suggest an alternative to the proposed rules:

\* Only apply the broad proposed definition of applicant to employers showing underutilization of women and/or minorities. EEO-1 reports should provide the government with the information needed to flag employers with discriminatory employment practices, and the draconian recordkeeping could be required only for them. I'm certain the government could automate the identification and notification of employers using EEO-1 filings. This would also provide an immediate, tangible incentive for employers to hire and promote women and minorities, to attain positive EEO-1 figures.

\* For employers with good EEO-1 stats, define an applicant as someone who is interviewed in person. For these applicants, it's easy and appropriate to obtain the statistics -- and when someone is seen in person is when the majority of discrimination, if any, is going to occur.

In short, your proposed guidelines impose an unfair burden on smaller companies like ChevronTexaco Credit Union that are already working hard to ensure that their employment practices are non-discriminatory, but that don't have automated systems. I'm very much in favor of any measures that will reduce discrimination, but I don't see how the proposed guidelines will achieve that.

Jill M. Staten  
Vice President, Human Resources  
ChevronTexaco Federal Credit Union